

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8

9 LEWIS ANDERSON,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 XAVIER BECERRA, *et al.*,

13 Defendants.
14

Case No. 1:20-cv-00068-DAD-SAB (PC)

ORDER DISREGARDING PLAINTIFF'S
SECOND APPLICATION TO PROCEED *IN*
FORMA PAUPERIS AS UNNECESSARY

(ECF No. 9)

15 Plaintiff Lewis Anderson is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* in this civil rights action
16 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

17 On January 14, 2020, Plaintiff initiated this action by filing a complaint and an application
18 to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (ECF Nos. 1, 2.) On January 17, 2020, the undersigned issued
19 findings and recommendations, recommending that Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma*
20 *pauperis* be denied pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), and that Plaintiff be ordered to pay the
21 \$400.00 filing fee in full in order to proceed with this action. (ECF No. 4.) The findings and
22 recommendations were served on Plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were
23 to be filed within thirty (30) days after service. (*Id.* at 4.) On February 3, 2020, Plaintiff filed
24 written objections to the findings and recommendations. (ECF No. 8.) As of this date, Plaintiff's
25 application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, (ECF No. 2), and the undersigned's January 17, 2020
26 findings and recommendations remain pending before the assigned District Judge.

27 Currently before the Court is Plaintiff's second application to proceed *in forma pauperis*,
28 filed on February 3, 2020. (ECF No. 9.) However, as Plaintiff's first application to proceed *in*

1 *forma pauperis* is still pending before the assigned District Judge, Plaintiff's second application is
2 unnecessary. Therefore, Plaintiff's second application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, (ECF No.
3 9), is HEREBY DISREGARDED as unnecessary.

4
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: **February 5, 2020**


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE